

children. The law preserves that opportunity for the child to be able to pay a subsidized price for that school lunch or, if the child is very poor, then to get the lunch free because the law provides that right now.

But under the new Republican proposal, not only would there not be a keeping of the pace with inflation and the growth of school population but at the same time the Republican bill guts that protection for children under the law that says you will get fed. Because we understand and have recognized under the law that it is important to make sure that you have the nutrition you need to be able to learn.

The Republican bill says, no, you will get fed if the Committee on Appropriations in the House and if the Committee on Appropriations in the Senate agrees that they will fund certain levels.

So when the Republicans talk about their funding levels of 4.5 percent increases, they are speculating because they haven't provided those moneys. Those aren't there, and they will not be there until the appropriating committees in each House each year decides that they will allocate the moneys.

Let me tell you, I have very little faith that future Congresses will allocate the moneys that are authorized to be spent.

Why do I say that? Well, last week we just finished, and I voted against this, proposing and adopting a bill that cut moneys. Where did it cut? Well, it did not do much to defense. It did not do anything to programs that are out there to subsidize the wealthy.

What it did do was it cut from students, from the elderly, from veterans. And if I look at how they were able to make cuts in those programs, I have very little faith that a program like school nutrition, which will no longer be protected under the law, will be protected from cuts in the future, especially if anyone in this Congress is serious about trying to balance the budget.

So whether we want to say we are providing more money or not, the reality is that under current law our kids are protected from the shenanigans and politics of Members of Congress under the Republican proposal that is gone, and we have to hope that not only will they provide the money they say but they will see the light and provide the actual dollars needed for that principal to provide not just the same meal but provide it to the growing number of kids in the school.

What does all this do to a place like Los Angeles, CA, a place that I represent? Well, if in fact we are going to lose the \$2.3 billion over the next 5 years that the Republican bill will cost us, which is about a 6 percent cut, then I know in Los Angeles, the Los Angeles Unified School District, which is the second largest school district in the Nation with something over 600 and some odd thousand students in it, close to 550,000 of those children who receive

subsidized or free lunches will not be able to eat, will not be able to eat the same amount, or will be told to wait until tomorrow.

That is a lot of meals. That is a lot of kids. I think we have to start doing something differently.

□ 2130

MORE ON WELFARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD].

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding to me. I simply asked for the time so I could respond to the comments of my very good friend, the gentlewoman from California, because frankly, she brought the debate back to where I think it should be and that is a fair debate.

The previous speaker raised legitimate issues about the difference between an entitlement program and a block grant. That is the level of the discussion that we ought to have. If we have that level of discussion, then we can talk about different strategies to balance the budget.

I came over here fairly upset because I am so angered to hear over and over again the use of the term "cutting" the funding for this program. It simply is not true. It really should not be said.

The level of debate will be elevated tremendously if we talk about different strategies, whether it is entitlements or block grants. We can do that. We can have honest differences of opinion. We might actually learn from each other and find some common ground.

I really would encourage my friends on the other side of the aisle to stop using the terminology of cutting funding for this program, when in fact the facts are, and I will repeat them, when the Democrats controlled the House and the Senate and the White House, they provided this program with a 3.1 percent increase and the president, in this year's budget, proposed 3.6 percent, and we have offered 4.5 percent for the next 5 years.

If the appropriators do not do that, that is a discussion for another day. And perhaps we will join some of you in voting against an appropriations bill that does not live up to the 4.5 percent authorization. But let us be honest about where we are in the process.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of debate, I would like to respond to the gentleman's comments. What we have to do, if we are going to debate this in a way that is clear to the American people, is to define our terms. The gentleman from Ohio was waving the

CRS report before and saying how much of an increase that the Republican proposal was of the school-based lunch plan versus, as you are referencing, President Clinton's increase on an entitlement program as opposed to a block grant.

The point I want to make is that what the gentleman was waving was already a cut, yes, a cut, because it is only referring to the school-based lunch program. It does not provide funding for the afternoon program or the summer school program. So you have already cut children's nutrition plans.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the debate on both sides as it relates to the nutrition program. I wanted to touch on welfare and the need for welfare, but first I have to make these comments as a former Democrat, that today I was interviewed by the Washington Post wanting to know why in the State of North Carolina that we went from 8 Democratic Congressmen, four Republicans to four Republican Congressmen and four—excuse me, eight Republican Congressmen and four Democrats. The whole purpose is simply because the new minority party was out of touch with the middle-class working American.

People in America are paying, the working family will spend half of what it makes on paying taxes and actually spend more on paying taxes than it will spend on clothing, housing and food. And this debate tonight about children is extremely important, and on our side we believe we are doing what is right for children.

I can tell the other side, after hearing the debate today and yesterday, that the American people are ready for downsizing Government. They are ready to see efficiency in programs. They are ready to see less taxes coming out of their paycheck. That is what I think the Republican party has done.

Let me talk just briefly, I know my time is short, about the facts on welfare. Since the 1960s, Washington has spent approximately \$5 trillion of taxpayers' money on the war on poverty. It is the most expensive war our Nation has ever waged, and it is a war we have lost. The amount we spend in a year on welfare is roughly three times the amount needed to raise the incomes of all poor Americans above the poverty income threshold. Nearly 65 percent of the people on welfare at any given time would be in the welfare system for 8 years or longer.

A record 14.3 million people now receive welfare benefits, a 31 percent increase since 1989. Funding for welfare programs is estimated to increase from \$325 billion in 1993 to \$500 billion in 1998.

My colleagues, the people of America are demanding welfare reform. We can debate as we should debate, being a democracy, but when we really come down to it, the working people of America are tired and fed up of seeing

their money wasted. It is our responsibility and obligation to pass welfare reform.

THE DEAL SUBSTITUTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DEAL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEAL. Mr. Speaker, I agree with my colleague from Tennessee, who joins me along the Tennessee-Georgia border, Mr. WAMP, on the Republican side. He said that we do not need partisanship in this issue. I would come here tonight to suggest that we have a solution that breaks the status quo, that changes the existing programs, and we do it in a way that we think works.

We ought to all be seeking solutions that work, rather than political rhetoric. I have listened to the debate all day today, and I have come to one conclusion. We probably need fewer speech writers and more mathematicians. The only trouble is, I am reminded of the saying that "figures don't lie but lies sure can figure." We seem to be caught up in that business of arguing about figures.

Now, there is something that is true, and I think my colleague made the point earlier, and that is this, you cannot have it both ways. In your welfare reform package you are either going to make cuts to have the savings to offset the tax cuts that are coming or you are not. You cannot have it both ways.

Now, we have talked about various aspects of this plan, and we focused just recently on talking about the child nutrition programs. I am looking here at a document that came from the majority leader's office in which he is talking about the savings from the Republican bill. Now, they are either savings or they are not savings. And according to this, it says that there are \$66.3 billion of savings over 5 years. I understand that figure may have increased now because of some other changes.

And the one area of title III of the bill of child care and nutrition, according to the majority leader's office, saves \$11.8 billion over 5 years. Well, I do not know whether you are talking about cuts or whether you are talking about cuts from base line. The point is, either you have savings or you do not have savings. They are either cuts or they are not cuts. You cannot have it both ways.

Now, let us talk about a few of the things that I think are significant, and I pointed this out today. My chart has had to be amended as a result of an en bloc amendment that came on the floor today. But this is a chart that compares and contrasts the Republican version of welfare reform with a substitute that I, along with several of my colleagues, will be offering. It talks about the concept of work.

I think all of us should agree that work is the best solution to breaking

the welfare cycle. And the question is, how do you get people off welfare and into work and how do you achieve that goal of keeping them in a work force?

We both have in our plans percentages of the population that must move into the work force at certain levels. As you will notice, the Republican plan started off at 4 percent. It is has now been amended up to 10 percent. Ours starts in 1997 with 16 percent going to a total of 52 percent at the final termination in the year 2003 and thereafter.

As a result of the amendments on the floor today, the work percentages of the Republican plan have now been increased significantly. In fact, cumulatively those percentages are about 52 percent, I believe. But the interesting thing to me is that if it costs to put people into a work program to move them off of welfare into the work force, if it costs money, and it obviously does, if it did not cost any money all of us would say 100 percent from the first day must be in the work force.

I would point out, however, that under the Republican plan, they allow people to stay on welfare for 2 years and do not require anything of them.

We require within 30 days that they must sign a self-sufficiency plan and they must begin the job search process. We also have a 4-year limit once they enter a work first program. Two years in work first, at the most 2 years in a community service plan, and then a State option if they choose to put them with a voucher system for 2 years at the maximum.

Now, if it does not cost any money to move people from welfare to work, then we ought to all put our percentages at 100 percent from the word go. If it does cost money to up the percentages, we have seen the percentages on work under here by an amendment but we have not seen any revenue flow to the States to pay for that. It does not work both ways. It either costs money to do this or it does not cost money to do this. If it costs money to increase your percentages, then we ought to have some reflection in the funding proposal to pay for it. We do not see that.

WELFARE REFORM IN ARIZONA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SALMON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, for the last 4 years I have been serving in the Arizona State legislature prior to coming to this noble institution.

One of the privileges that I have had is to co-chair the Joint Select Committee on Children and Family Services. What I have seen over the last several years has really frightened me.

I think that government has become the great enabler. Those of us that have dealt with programs with alcoholics, people that we have tried to help to get off the problem, recognize that first of all, they have to have a desire deep

inside that they want to change that terrible situation that has been plaguing them for probably many years. But if they do not decide that they want to change, it is not going to happen.

I think government has become the great enabler with welfare programs in that we have basically robbed people of self-dignity. We have told them, we do not want you in mainstream society. We will pay you to stay at home because you really have no value to society. I think it is a very counterfeit type of compassion. Just as it would be with the alcoholic that is going through detox, when they are writhing in agony and going through the pain, to offer them a bottle of scotch to solve their problem, I believe that the government programs that have really trapped people in a snare of government dependency and replaced it with nothing, which has robbed people of their self-dignity. They have got to be replaced. We have to flee from those programs as fast as we can.

I do not mean to belittle the efforts tonight of the minority party in trying to reform the system. But I will say, with all due respect, you have had 30 years to do it so I am not sure that the sincerity of the effort tonight is truly noted.

I really feel that it is time for us to get off of our duff. It is time for us to help people to help themselves.

It was a great President on his inauguration that said, ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country. How quickly, it has only been three short decades since that prophetic declaration was made, and here we are today trying to be mother and father to people that really on their own are crying for dignity and they want the ability to be able to help themselves and get out of the trap that they are ensnared in, the destructive trap that they are ensnared in.

In Arizona, we were able to pass some really key reforms within the last couple of years. In fact, I would like to talk a little bit about one of my favorite people in Arizona. It is Charles Barkley.

Mr. Speaker, there are at least two huge differences between President Bill Clinton and Arizona's own Charles Barkley. Sir Charles, for one, backs up his big talk with big action. We have no such luck with Bill Clinton.

In my home State, we have been waiting for the Clinton administration HHS to grant us a waiver so we can implement our State's innovative welfare reform proposals.

Let me tell you about one of the pilot programs which would cash out the value of food stamps and give it to an employer to subsidize them to hire an employee, to hire a welfare recipient. It is a win/win. They get a job. They get dignity and self-respect and the employer gets a valued employee.

Our bill was signed by the governor a year ago but the waiver paperwork was done last August. I personally wrote